

## COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND TRAFFIC

**March 21, 2006**

**6:00 PM**

Chairman Osborne called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Osborne, O'Neil, Shea, Roy, Long

Messrs.: R. Sherman, K. Sheppard, R. Fitzgerald, J. Hoben, Lt. Valenti

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Communication from Michael Egan, Vice President of B5ONE, requesting the use of Arms Park on Sunday, May 21, 2006, in conjunction with a Volkswagen and Audi Car Show event.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to approve the request.

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from Randy Sherman, Deputy Finance Officer, submitting a draft letter to Chris Luz regarding his return to Manchester for further discussion of the Parking Study.

Randy Sherman, Deputy Finance Officer, stated I wasn't at the last Committee meeting but my understanding is that you requested that we go back and create a draft letter to bring back to the Committee that we could forward along to Chris Luz from Lansing-Melbourne and try to get him back into town. He has offered to come back for just his out-of-pocket costs so we could get him in for a couple of days. My understanding was the Committee wanted staff to try to draft this letter so that when he comes back to town there would be a certain number of items that he would specifically focus on and we would make it a really productive meeting with them. Staff did meet – Police, Fire, Traffic, Finance, and Solicitor and these are the items that we came up with that we thought Mr. Luz could address at one Committee meeting. I have talked to Chris about this and he has requested if at all possible that we make this in the April 17/April 18 timeframe, which is roughly about a month from now. It is a Monday/Tuesday. The thought is that if we could have a special meeting on April 17 and if it was the Committee's desire that something be brought to the Board on April 18 he would stick around for that as

well. Again, the letter is in draft form and we will take any recommendations that the Committee members have.

Chairman Osborne asked should we table this.

Alderman O'Neil stated should we table or just refer it to a special meeting tentatively on April 17.

Mr. Sherman responded I guess what I am looking for is if you are okay with this letter I will drop it in the mail to Chris tomorrow and work with the Clerk to try to schedule a special meeting on April 17.

Alderman O'Neil moved to authorize the Deputy Finance Officer to send out the letter requesting the meeting at the dates recommended. Alderman Roy duly seconded the motion. Chairman Osborne called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Discussion relating to coordination of services and utilities during storm events such as what occurred on February 10, 2006 as requested by Alderman O'Neil.

Alderman O'Neil stated I spoke with Chief Kane. He is going to be setting up a meeting with the utilities to have a discussion about this. I don't know if it is appropriate that we table this for a report later.

Deputy Clerk Normand responded we can do that if you would like to.

Alderman O'Neil moved to table. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion. Chairman Osborne called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman O'Neil stated they may be in a position to report back next month or it may be a couple of months before they are able to report back. I am fine with that as long as it is in the works.

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Discussion relating to police details as it relates to construction and/or nightclub details as requested by Alderman O'Neil.

Alderman O'Neil stated this may be another one to table. Deputy Chief Simmons called me and they have started discussion at the Police Department about the issue. They would like to get all of their data together. There is a concern if we address just the nightclub issue what does that do to construction details and will they not have a police officer for that then. I think the message is there to them that we are asking them to look at this issue but I would move to put it on the table and ask them to report back.

Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Shea stated I would like to find out the responsibilities of the police detail vis a vis the people that are in the nightclubs – the bouncers they call them or people who supervise. I think that is very important as far as how much responsibility one has and where one's responsibility begins and the other starts and so forth. I think that would be helpful for me personally anyway.

Chairman Osborne called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Discussion relating to graffiti as requested by Chairman Osborne.

Chairman Osborne stated I just wanted to bring this up to the Committee. Over the years we have been having a lot of problems with graffiti all over the City and it is not getting any better it is getting worse. If you notice Hunts Pool or just about anywhere you go up on the DW Highway in Alderman Roy's ward there or the filling station or no matter where you look today all you see is graffiti. I am sure the senior citizens are not going out there to do it. What I am trying to do here...I know we have a graffiti clean up truck and that is fine but we have to try and put a damper on it somehow. I feel that the best thing to do right now would be to tend to our public parks and pools and so on and so forth. As you see on the side of me here I had a sign made up, which reads "Graffiti – Maximum Penalty Jail Time RSA 634:2", which is in the books. So a lot these people out there or a lot of the people that are causing this I don't think realize that this is a serious situation. What it carries is \$1,000 or more in penalty. Not only that but if they do \$1,000 more or damage they can get jail time for this. Also it is a felony. It is a Class B felony to do this so I think it takes a little bit of education more than it does anything right now. If the newspapers can grab a hold of this and get it in the newspaper to make it known out there to these people that it could be a serious consequence to them...this is why I would like to put these up. I already talked to Parks & Recreation about it. I am going to have Kevin Sheppard come up.

Alderman Shea asked could you review the responsibility of the person that we hired to remove the graffiti and where it stands now so we can get a handle on this.

Kevin Sheppard, Deputy Public Works Director, stated as you know the Board of Mayor and Aldermen approved a full-time graffiti removal person. We do have the equipment. That person is on the road probably 10 or 11 months out of the year as weather permits. The CIP Committee recently approved the policy for removing graffiti from private property. We have removed quite a bit from private property but our priority still is public property, including Hunt's Pool or any other locations that are reported. It is our opinion that we have been doing a good job and as they have been reported to us we have been cleaning them. I do agree with Alderman Osborne that there continues to be graffiti out there and he is looking to post signs...anything to reduce the amount of graffiti out there is obviously helpful to us in the City.

Chairman Osborne stated I don't mean putting a lot of signs out there. I don't like that myself but if we can just put a couple in each area like Hunt's Pool and then have the graffiti truck go over there and clean that mess up and let's see what happens after it is cleaned with those signs there. It will give us some kind of an idea if they are working or not working but the City is still not doing anything because nothing is being done.

Alderman Roy asked how many signs, how many locations and what is the cost. The graffiti truck was in Ward 1 at Livingston Park today and it was fantastic to see some of the graffiti going away. I know we have a few locations in my ward as well as every ward throughout the City. I would be in favor of this education process of letting people know that it is jail time or there is a penalty. My question so I can form a motion is how many signs do you want to create, how many locations and what is the timeframe and cost?

Chairman Osborne stated first of all the signs are there anyway. We have 25 signs that have been sitting there for I don't know how many years and they were never used. I am using old signs. I am not trying to create any expense here. We are taking these signs here and I am painting the other side of them so we can put them on a building. We are not going to have them on a pole or anything like that. I have talked to Mr. Ludwig about it recently and I would let him decide where he wants to start putting them just to get some sort of a study of what is going to happen with them before we distribute them throughout the whole City.

Alderman Roy moved to have the 25 signs repainted, delivered to Parks & Recreation and distributed at the Director's discretion. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Shea asked so within the jurisdiction of Parks & Recreation.

Chairman Osborne answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked are we saying then that the only problems in the City are in parks. What about schools?

Chairman Osborne answered well we have that too but we have to start somewhere without creating a big expense like Alderman Roy was talking about. We have to have some sort of a study before we start distributing signs. We could...I would love to put one on every school. I have no problem with it. Would you like to make a motion to that effect?

Alderman O'Neil responded well if these are going to go up there should be a report back as to where they go up and there needs to be some tracking on what they do. Not just put them up and say okay that is going to solve all of the problems.

Chairman Osborne replied I will track them.

Alderman O'Neil stated well I think there needs to be a report back to the Board on what the results are.

Chairman Osborne responded there will be. I am sure Ron will bring a report back.

Alderman Roy stated I would ask that as we create these signs let's plan on their success and have the Traffic Department and Highway look at a cost so that when signs are ordered either by school or private companies we can give them a cost to go ahead and keep the message consistent and hopefully that will help.

Chairman Osborne responded I don't know about Highway but I think the Traffic Department would be handling the cost of that. Secondly, the School Department again if we are going to put them on schools and everything else I think they would have to take a little bit of the cost of that also. Other than that the reason again and I want to stress this for anybody that is listening or whatever a lot of you out there don't realize that there is a penalty like this that exists on the books. If they are caught they could go to jail. It is that simple. It depends on the situation but still it is a chance they are taking.

Alderman Long stated just so I understand what we are doing is we are creating 25 signs and it is just going to Parks, Recreation & Cemetery right now and there will

be a report that will come back to us as to whether or not it is working and then we can expand it if we need to.

Chairman Osborne responded that is correct.

Alderman Shea stated I would like Kevin if he could to try to help the Committee here in terms of the graffiti problem itself. In other words the gentlemen or the people who are doing the removal...I think it would be helpful to get kind of a feel or an understanding of really how much graffiti there is. How much time is being spent on it as well as the expense involved because obviously he might have an understanding that there are 20 or 30 public buildings that need to have it removed and the location and so forth as far as whether one area is being concentrated upon rather than other areas and so forth so that we might get an understanding as to whether we are putting enough emphasis on this and whether we can work together with the OYS or Police or other agencies or your department as far as how much money we should allocate for this. Is there a need for additional expenditure, which I hate to say but is there a need for this and how much cooperation are we getting from the private sector in terms of how much they are willing to pay to remove graffiti from their buildings and what are they doing about it if anything? These are the kinds of questions that I would like to see answered at a future meeting.

Mr. Sheppard responded sure.

Chairman Osborne stated I hope we can get some sort of ink from the newspapers with this. I think the more we can bring this to the public's attention the better off we are going to be. It is called education I guess and knowledge of law.

Chairman Osborne called for a vote on the motion to have the 25 signs repainted, delivered to Parks & Recreation and distributed at the Director's discretion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Osborne advised that the Traffic Department has submitted an agenda, which needs to be addressed as follows:

Deputy Clerk Normand stated there is an addition to the traffic agenda and that is to rescind parking for two hours from 4 PM to 10 PM on Auburn Street, north side, from Lincoln Street to Maple Street (Ord. #8851) and that was submitted by A5.

**STOP SIGNS:**

On Page Street at London Street, NWC, SEC (4-Way School Zone)  
Alderman Duval

On Old Wellington Road at Eastern Avenue, NEC, SWC  
Alderman Pinard

**NO PARKING:**

On Hayward Street, north side, from Union Street to a point 275 feet westerly  
Alderman Long

**NO PARKING ANYTIME:**

On River Road, west side, from West Webster Street to a point 145 feet southerly  
Alderman Roy

**NO PARKING (THURSDAY 3PM-5 PM/SATURDAY 9AM-5PM) –  
EMERGENCY ACT:**

On Lakeside Drive, both sides, from Rte. 28 Bypass to a point 605 feet west  
Alderman Pinard

**RESCIND NO PARKING:**

On Amory Street, north side, from Reed Street to Joliette Street (ORD. 2561)  
Aldermen Thibault/Lopez

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Long it was voted to approve the traffic agenda with the addition as noted by the Clerk.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Deputy Clerk Normand stated we have two new items of business that I will hand out. The first one is a request from Merrill Lynch for three vacant spots in the Middle Street parking lot.

Alderman O'Neil stated Mr. Fitzgerald is here.

Chairman Osborne called Mr. Fitzgerald forward.

Roger Fitzgerald, Merrill Lynch, 900 Elm Street, Manchester stated:  
What I am asking for is there are three parking spaces in the Middle Street lot between Franklin and Market Street that became vacant over the last week and a half and I believe there are three more coming vacant in the next month. I know the parking situation has been difficult and I have been requesting the three spots for the Merrill Lynch employees there until the parking situation becomes a permanent situation.

Alderman O'Neil stated I mentioned to Mr. Fitzgerald that the Board has taken the position of we have turned down a number of requests but he brought up a very good point. There are going to be three spaces open and probably another three spaces coming along. What do we do with those in the meantime? It is kind of like a Catch-22. Do we put meters back in there? I have to be honest. I am not sure the permit parking has worked in that lot. You pull in there sometimes and there is nobody in there. I know we are putting some stock in the parking consultant to help solve some of those problems but his point about what do you do in the meantime when you have 3-6 parking spaces that are theoretically going to be vacant and not used.

Alderman Roy stated I agree quite a bit with Alderman O'Neil but my concern is that when we have received these in the past we have turned them down and I would hate to just go ahead and approve these when other people have been turned down. There hasn't been a waiting list process that I am aware of. I don't know if Denise can speak to that. Unless we say we are going to remarket or reopen this lot for permits I would hate to just because your timing is excellent reward you with that. I appreciate you bringing this request to us but in fairness I would be hesitant to approve something without everyone who has requested in the past being notified that they are available.

Alderman Shea asked could you lead me through the fact that there are going to be three spaces vacant. Prior to them being vacant what was their disposition?

Mr. Fitzgerald responded I believe one business on Elm Street is out of business.

Alderman Shea asked did they have a permit for those spaces.

Mr. Fitzgerald answered yes they did. I believe they came due on March 16.

Alderman Shea asked how did they get...I am new to this Committee but how did they get permission when we don't grant permission. In other words how come they had permits and now we are saying we don't do that?

Alderman O'Neil answered I believe and I wasn't on the Traffic Committee the last two years but I believe over the years the Traffic Committee has...you know it started out very slowly with three here and add another three and it just kept growing and growing over a period of many years and more and more spaces becoming permanent. My guess is they had approval from the Traffic Committee to do this.

Alderman Shea asked the Traffic Committee to come forward and comment on this.



Jim Hoben, Deputy Traffic Director, stated I believe the first ones that were granted three spaces were the Little Saigon Restaurant. They originally came in and then the owner of That Look came in and he wanted three. The whole lot was metered but it started with Little Saigon who wanted spaces for take outs and deliveries. Then it grew to the whole West Side of the lot.

Alderman Shea asked so the question would be do we want to consider granting three spots to this particular company because another business has decided not to use these or do we want to have these particular spots metered I guess. Are those the options at this time?

Mr. Hoben answered well if you didn't grant more permits we were going to...we were waiting for this meeting to see what the Committee did but we were going to put the meters back in for those three spaces.

Alderman Long asked when we were turning down other requests for permits was it at metered spots where we had to remove the meter. As you mentioned Jim if we decline this you would be looking to put the meters back in there right?

Mr. Hoben answered yes we would put the three-meter heads back up.

Alderman Long asked what is the cost for the permits right now.

Mr. Hoben answered \$45/month.

Alderman Long stated and there are three available now and there will be three available at some later time in the near future.

Mr. Hoben responded according to Mr. Fitzgerald yes.

Chairman Osborne stated the concern I have with it is this. There were meters there before and they took them out and did what they did and now you want to pick up these three spaces but I am thinking of...I guess the Traffic Committee opened a can of worms at the time but what happens here is what about the other office space and other people around that area who have clients coming in and so on? If we eat up the whole parking lot with bags and leased spaces it kind of limits the rest of the businesses in that area. I know it is a good deal. The \$45 I have no problem with you paying but it is just the convenience of other businesses as well as yourself.

Mr. Fitzgerald responded I understand that and in this past year since Little Saigon has opened and a few other businesses on Elm it has taken our parking spots away.

The municipal parking lot is getting smaller and smaller and unfortunately I am going in and out of my office outside of appointments all day and my assistant is doing likewise going to different businesses. I was just trying to come here and say if there are three available I would like to request them.

Chairman Osborne replied I don't blame you. I think we should start turning the other way with this and leave that lot with meters and leave it open for everybody, not just for certain places. That is my opinion.

Alderman Roy stated with all due respect to Mr. Fitzgerald and I feel your pain because parking around here is tight but I do believe that we should be consistent and I would be saying this no matter who is sitting in front of me so I do apologize and I know that getting parking for your office is hard but I would ask that like we have in the past we deny this request. On that same note I would like to ask Jim Hoben to go ahead and work through some kind of waiting list so that as these come up either there is a policy set to return them to meters or a policy that we keep track of who has put in requests like this so that we can be reacting and either issuing permits or immediately putting back meters. We can't be inconsistent like we could be by voting for this. Again, my apologies Mr. Fitzgerald but I would move to deny your request and ask the Traffic Department to establish some type of policy for how we can fill these in the future.

Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated the Board and it may have been with the support of the full Board, may have put a moratorium on issuing anymore permits anyway. I am not sure the Committee has the power to issue anymore. I think Mr. Fitzgerald being here points out that we have to come up with something in that lot because what is going on now is not working. I appreciate him writing the letter to at least start that discussion. He is probably not getting the result he was looking for but this will force us to take a look at that lot.

Mr. Hoben stated this Committee has the authority to set the policy.

Chairman Osborne responded I think there is a moratorium out there that was voted on by the full Board so there is no sense in us doing it.

Alderman O'Neil stated I would encourage Mr. Fitzgerald to watch what happens in the next few weeks with this Committee and the Board because if there are openings naturally we do want to fill them and if we establish a waiting list I would love to see you participate in that.

Mr. Fitzgerald responded I am on a waiting list already. I have already started that process.

Chairman Osborne called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Osborne stated I wanted to bring something in and I hope we can do this in five minutes. It has to do with signs that we have throughout the City here. I would like to call up Lt. Valenti. This is just something for the Committee to listen to and digest. I have talked about this for quite awhile also. It seems like we have a lot of "No Parking Driveway" signs out there. There are really too many. It is becoming a blight to the City. We have had things on the books for years, which I knew 20 years ago that you can't park in front of somebody's driveway anyway within 5' of each side. Throughout the years I guess they were put up for different constituents because people would park in front of their driveway once in awhile. I don't think it happens too often anyway but also...did we pass out that ordinance.

Alderman O'Neil stated the Public Safety and Traffic Committee in the last session actually referred this very issue to City staff. I know there was at least one meeting on it and I don't know that they have ever met again. I agree with you. We are posting signs nears fire hydrants. I can remember Lt. Valenti sitting here saying it doesn't need to be posted for a police officer to write a ticket. The same thing for parking in a driveway. There is supposed to be a committee of City staff meeting on this and that is from six or eight months ago. I think if the Clerk looked at the record this Committee asked for that to be set-up. You may be duplicating something that people are already working on.

Chairman Osborne responded I don't think so and if I can finish I don't think I am duplicating anything but anyway what we are doing here...I had another ordinance written up, which I know they are not doing. Number one for parking in front of a driveway do you know how much it costs if they get a ticket? Do you know how much it costs?

Alderman O'Neil replied I don't

Chairman Osborne responded it is \$20. Now what I put in for is an ordinance that would make the fine \$50 for parking in front of somebody's driveway and \$100 for a second offense. This will kind of deter this type of a thing. I don't think there are too many people out there really who park in front of somebody's driveway. I can't comprehend that all. I just can't comprehend that one. Anyway if there is somebody that does it is going to cost them \$50 and I don't think they are coming back. So I would like to see this happen. I know the people out

there...I have them in my ward to and I know they like that sign but I think enforcement is a better thing than to have a bunch of signs blight our City.

Alderman O'Neil stated I absolutely agree with you and can I ask Lt. Valenti a question. What is the fine for parking in front of a hydrant?

Lt. Valenti responded I believe we have it the same as a no parking fine.

Alderman O'Neil asked so if you park in front of a fire hydrant it is only a \$20 ticket.

Lt. Valenti answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated for some reason I thought it was more than that. If we are going to send this on...I have no problem with what you are doing but I would like to see the fine for parking in front of fire hydrants increased as well. People are just parking in front of those now like it is nothing.

Chairman Osborne stated we will take one step at a time. I think the last time \$20 was put in here for parking in a driveway they had horse and buggies. It is time to move on here. A \$50 bill is not the end of the world either but it will deter the ones that are parking there. I still can't comprehend why people park in front of somebody's driveway but at least it will give the people out there that have these signs now a little more security saying well they are going to get hit with \$50 so I am calling the Manchester Police Department and they will get a \$50 fine.

Alderman Shea stated I would probably go along with this but I want people that have signs now to be grandfathered in. I don't believe it makes much sense to remove signs from areas where they have already been placed. I don't know how other members of the Committee feel. To start removing signs from every driveway is counterproductive but I leave it up to the Lieutenant or the other people to comment on that.

Chairman Osborne responded either we do this or we don't do it. If we just leave all of those out there now they are going to be out there until...well not in our lifetime but after that they will still be there. We have to do this...I have them in my ward as well as you do in your ward. I don't like having to do this either but that is why I brought up the fine on this so they have a good feeling saying well it is a \$50 fine for parking in front of my driveway now and it is a \$100 second offense. I don't think they are going to do it a second time anyway but I think this takes the place of the signs. That is why I would like to get rid of all of these signs. Pull them all up. There is no need for them. There is no reason for them and I think it should be done. That is my opinion.

Alderman Roy stated I have a question for Lt. Valenti or the Chairman. The language in bold states parking within 5' of a private driveway. What is the current ordinance as far as distance? Are we recreating something?

Lt. Valenti replied no it is currently 5 feet.

Alderman Roy stated so technically it shouldn't be in bold because it is staying within the regular distance but just increasing the fine.

Lt. Valenti responded correct.

Alderman Roy moved to approve the ordinance to increase the fines for parking within 5' of a private driveway to \$50 for the first offense and \$100 for the second offense.

Alderman O'Neil asked can I amend that to include fire hydrants.

Alderman Roy answered absolutely.

Chairman Osborne asked Mr. Arnold can we do that. Can we put fire hydrants at \$50 for the first offense and \$100 for the second offense?

Thomas Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, answered yes I could rework a draft of this ordinance and include the fine for parking in front of a fire hydrant.

Alderman Shea asked does that include removing present signs from driveways.

Alderman Roy answered my motion did not. If somebody else wants to make that motion they can.

Chairman Osborne asked you mean you want to leave the signs that are in place now there.

Alderman Roy answered yes. My motion is just that we increase the fines for the offense. If somebody else wants to worry about the over abundance of signage then that is a separate motion from mine.

Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion as amended. Chairman Osborne called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Osborne stated so the next thing would be to remove all existing signs that are out there now – the No Parking in Driveway signs because of the increase

that we just did here. It doesn't make any sense to increase this to \$50 and \$100 if we are going to leave the signs there. You might as well leave it at \$20.

Alderman Shea stated I would be for that if we studied all of the signs that are up in different places that are extra, that are not needed and that the people come back from the Police Department or the Traffic Department and say look we have X number of signs in the City in addition to the signs that are in driveways that we really can remove. I would be in favor of that but to selectively place certain people who have the signs there and say we are going to remove your signs but other people who have signs that are not necessary that are obviously in different wards I would say remove those as well and I would be in favor.

Chairman Osborne responded I don't think there is anything out there in people's driveways.

Alderman Shea stated I would suggest that the Traffic Department come back to us and say are there six signs on one corner but they only need three or are there four signs one corner and you only need two and so forth and so on. So if we are going to remove signs let's remove all of the signs that are not necessary rather than zeroing in on certain signs in selective areas of people's residences.

Chairman Osborne replied these are the ones that I am working on first. There are others that I have in mind like "No Parking Here to Corner." There are other signs out there that are a little too much too.

Alderman Shea stated well let's do it all at once rather than be selective that is what I say.

Chairman Osborne stated well I don't think so myself but that is your prerogative. Is there a motion on removing the existing signs?

Alderman O'Neil stated back two years ago I said there were too many signs up. If we are going to take down just driveway we need to take down all of the others that are around that in my opinion are wasteful.

Chairman Osborne asked so you want to do them all at once instead of taking some at a time.

Alderman O'Neil stated well are we going to send the Traffic Department out to just hit those signs and then sometime later on the same street in the same block have them take down another set of signs. I think you are on to something here but I want to see it done all at once.

Chairman Osborne replied they can't do it without our permission. They can't go up to a block and say we are going to pull this one out or I don't think we need this one. They have to come back to the Board or Committee for that don't they?

Alderman Roy stated my concern with the signage is basically every sign that is up should have gone through the process where a constituent called an Alderman or the Traffic Department or the Police Department, it came in front of this Committee at a certain time, was approved by the Committee, went on to the full Board and was approved by the full Board. If we enact a motion that we take away all signs, I am afraid that the homeowners that fought to get those signs and took the time to get those signs are not being represented. They took their time to go through the motion. What I would like to see is that we enact this and as people pay attention and receive the fine then those same people either through written correspondence or a phone call to their Alderman would have those signs removed and it becomes as slow a process coming down as it was going up but if a resident on River Road feels that their sign is pertinent we are not making a blanket judgement that that person on River Road is different than someone else across the City that doesn't want their sign. I would like to go through the same process that we have in the past. We put them up one by one so let's take them down one by one as requested by the constituent. That is where I stand on that.

Chairman Osborne stated well we will take a vote. They will never come down. It will never all happen. Okay. Fine.

Alderman Long stated there was no motion.

Deputy Clerk Normand stated we have one final item of new business and that is from the NH Fisher Cats requesting 12 additional parking spaces to be located behind right field on South Commercial Street Extension for home games. These spaces would be used for the press and the second request is to bag 19 meters on South Commercial Street for five different games, which are deemed educational days where schools, groups and organizations would participate and use those spaces for parking.

Alderman Roy moved to approve both requests.

Alderman O'Neil asked can we take them separately.

Alderman Roy moved to approve the first request to add the 12 parking spaces.

Alderman O'Neil asked can Mr. Thomas tell us if that is a width wide enough...I don't know if staff has even seen these requests yet.

Lt. Valenti answered yes I have seen it.

Alderman O'Neil stated Frank Thomas is shaking his head no. I don't know if that street is wide enough to do that.

Chairman Osborne stated that is what I am wondering. Everybody is in a rush here to approve it.

Alderman O'Neil stated I am definitely in favor of the second request to bag the meters for the daytime games for the school kids but the first one I think we need to have...if Alderman Roy would be okay with tabling this.

Alderman Roy moved to table the first request for review by Traffic and Highway and report back at the next meeting. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion. Chairman Osborne called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Roy moved to approve the second request to bag 19 meters on South Commercial Street during the education days for bus parking. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Osborne stated basically these meters...how many are involved.

Mr. Hoben answered 19.

Chairman Osborne asked how much does that consist of money wise that the City is losing.

Mr. Hoben answered if the 19 were full for five hours it would be \$47.50 per day. This is just for five days.

Chairman Osborne called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Long it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee